

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action mailed May 17, 2005 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 4 and 12 are canceled. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-16 are now pending in this application, with claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 being the only independent claims. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action mailed May 17, 2005, the drawings were objected to as not including the legend "--Prior Art--" in Figs. 1a and 1b. Replacement drawings were submitted with the amendment filed October 29, 2004 which included Figs. 1a and 1b. These replacement drawings included the legend "--Prior Art--". However, the scanned drawings in the image wrapper file do not include the legend "Prior Art", perhaps because the drawings from the published international application were scanned instead of the replacement drawings. A copy of the previously submitted replacement drawings is accordingly attached hereto with the requested legend. It is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings now be withdrawn.

Claim 12 is objected to because the phrase "predetermined short message destination number" lacks proper antecedent basis. The limitations of claim 12 are now incorporated into independent claim 9. The phrase "predetermined short message destination number" has been changed to --predetermined destination number--, which has proper antecedent basis. In view of this amendment, the objection to claim 12 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Applicant's admission of prior art (APA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,629 (Sawyer).

Independent claim 1 is now amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 4, and independent claim 9 is now amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 12. Each

of independent claims 1 and 9 now recites that the converter component converts “the predetermined destination number into a second destination number that refers to the data network”.

The Examiner has agreed that the APA fails to teach or suggest the above limitations of original claims 4 and 12. It is respectfully submitted that Sawyer also fails to teach or suggest the above limitations because Sawyer discloses that the SMS message sent to the message center already includes a destination network and address. Sawyer relates to a telephone network providing for inter-network short message service (SMS) message transmissions (see col. 1, lines 8-10 of Sawyer). According to Sawyer, a cellular communications network includes a mobile switching center (MSC) 18 (col. 3, lines 12-15). The cellular network 10 is connected to other networks 20(1), 20(2), and 20(3) by the MSC 18 (col. 3, lines 15-21). The MSC 18 includes a message center 22 for receiving, storing, and forwarding SMS messages (col. 3, lines 31-34). The message center 22 is conventional and further includes an inter-network communication functionality (ICF) 28 (col. 3, lines 47-50). The ICF 28 converts between different message formats (col. 4, lines 3-6). For example, an SMS message generated by a mobile station may be converted by the ICF 28 and delivered as a fax over telephone network 20(1) or as an e-mail message over LAN/WAN 20(2/3) (col. 3, lines 56-61). As shown in Figs. 2C and 2D, the SMS message delivered to the message center includes a destination network and address (col. 4, lines 48-67).

Since Sawyer discloses that the SMS message sent from a mobile terminal to the message center includes a destination network and address, there is no reason or need to convert any destination number in Sawyer. Accordingly, Sawyer fails to disclose, teach or suggest a converter component that converts “the predetermined destination number into a second

destination number that refers to the data network”, as is expressly recited in each of independent claims 1 and 9.

The Examiner states that col. 5, lines 1-5, of Sawyer discloses the above limitation. However, that section of Sawyer merely states that the address field of the SMS message does not have to identify the message center because the SMS message is automatically sent to the message center. Col. 5, lines 6-12, which directly follows the section of Sawyer indicated by the Examiner, reiterates that the SMS message includes the destination address to which the message is to be delivered. As pointed out above, the inclusion of the destination address in the SMS message as disclosed by Sawyer fails to provide or support any motivation to convert the destination number to a second destination number that refers to the data network, as is expressly recited in each of independent claims 1 and 9.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, independent claims 1 and 9 are respectfully deemed allowable over the APA in view of Sawyer, and withdrawal of the section 103 rejection of the claims is solicited.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any such fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,  
COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By



Lance J. Lieberman  
Reg. No. 28,437  
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210  
New York, New York 10176  
(212) 687-2770

Dated: August 17, 2005

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figs. 1a and 1b. This sheet, which includes Figs. 1a and 1b, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 1a and 1b.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet